

STUPIDITY OF A STUPID PRIDE -HEADGEAR AND ISLAM-

By:

Mujlisul Ulama of South Africa
P. O. Box 3393 – Port Elizabeth – 6056 –
South Africa

STUPIDITY OF A STUPID PRIDE –HEADGEAR AND ISLAM–

WHEN A YOUNGSTER allegedly presented his kufr leanings to his allegedly ‘molvie’ teacher regarding the **Wajib** (compulsory) Sunnah practice of wearing a topi (Islamic headgear), his errant modernist uncle with kufr leanings of equal or worse intensity, patted himself on his own back by blurting out: “*I was very proud of my nephew.*” In an attack on the Sunnah of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) – on the Sunnah of the Islamic Headgear which is compulsory at all times, not only when performing Salaat – the miscreant uncle writing in the modernist tabloid, *Al-Qalam*, sought to elevate his little nephew by denigrating the child’s Ustaad. In brief, the kufr argument goes as follows:

- The Sunnah headgear is nothing – it is nonsense – it is a mockery. This is the clear implication.
- There is no ‘*daleel*’ for the claim that the topi is necessary – as if the miscreant modernist writer understands anything about *daleel*.
- The ‘molvie’ teacher was allegedly stumped by the stupid alleged argument of the child.
- The book, *Fiqh us-Sunnah* of the modernist Egyptian writer, Sayyid Sabiq, supersedes the consensus of the entire Ummah – of the Aimmah-e-Mujtahideen, of the Fuqaha and the 14 century practice of Islam, viz., the compulsory wearing of a topi or Islamic headgear.
- That what is written by Sayyid Sabiq is the final word in *daleel*. In fact it surpasses the *Dalaail* of the Fuqaha (Jurists of Islam) – those Jurists who were the Students of the Sahaabah.

Citing from Sabiq’s book, the miscreant modernist presents the following passage in refutation of Islam’s practice of the topi: “*Ibn Asakir related that the Prophet would sometimes remove his cap and place it in front of him as a sutrah. According to the Hanafiyyah*

one can pray with his head uncovered. In fact they prefer this if it is done out of a sense of humility and awe. There is no evidence whatsoever that it is preferred to cover one's head while praying."

If the so-called 'scholar', Sabiq, had failed to understand the narration he had cited due to his own shallowness of understanding and deviation from the Path of the Sunnah, then we can overlook the miscreant modernist's inability to grasp what the cited Hadith states, conveys and implies. It should be understood that Sayyid Sabiq is not an authority on the Shariah. He is one of the semi-modernist deviates who finds it difficult to distinguish between right and left, light and darkness. When a man quotes a total non-entity as his *daleel*, then it is a vociferous proclamation of his own ignorance. His talk about '*daleel*' is truly laughable.

The very first thing which is portrayed saliently in Ibn Asakir's narration is the irrefutable fact that it was the permanent practice of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) to wear a topi, hence the statement: "...the Prophet would **sometimes** remove his cap..." This statement knocks the bottom out from Sabiq's claim, from the miscreant's '*daleel*' and from the child's alleged argument which the phantom 'molvi saheb' allegedly could not answer.

The narration does not even allude to a bare-head practice which modernist Muslims have acquired from their western kuffaar masters and teachers. It plainly states that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would **sometimes** depart from his normal permanent practice of wearing his topi and use it for a specific purpose. The narration does not purport that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) usually or permanently performed Salaat without a topi / turban. And a turban without a topi is haraam.

Furthermore, the narration explicitly states that Nabi (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) would **sometimes** remove his topi to use it "**as a sutrah**". In this narration which the modernist deviate seeks to present as a '*daleel*' for the bare-head kufr practice, there is no mention of '*sense of humility and awe*'. The reason for this **sometimes** (rare) practice of Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) is explicitly stated to be "**as a sutrah**". We presume that

the miscreant modernist understands what a *sutrah* is, hence we shall not elaborate on its need and significance. Every Muslim who possesses a basic education of the elementary Deenyaat taught to seven year olds in the Maktabas, will know that a *topi* is not normally used as a *sutrah*. For some reason or the other, Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) used his *topi* on the particular occasion as a *sutrah*. He had removed his *topi* for a reason – a good reason – to use it as a *sutrah*. He did not remove his *topi* in emulation of the kuffaar practice which the modernist deviates in our age have adopted as their ideal and permanent practice, and in opposition and derision of the Sunnah practice of covering the head.

Far from Ibn Asakir's narration being a '*daleel*' for the kufr practice of baring the head, especially in Salaat, it is on the contrary a confirmation of the Waajib practice of covering the head. The **sometimes** dimension explicitly and emphatically confirms the imperativeness of donning a *topi*, especially for Salaat purposes because it clearly conveys to men of intelligence – not to modernist ignoramuses – that Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) always wore a *topi* and on this particular occasion he had departed from his usual practice to use his *topi* as a *sutrah*. The attitude of an intelligent Muslim of sound Imaan would be to seek an explanation for Rasulullah's occasional and rare departure from his permanent practice and Sunnah. The intelligent Muslim will not attempt to justify and solidify a kaafir style by means of the Nabi's occasional practice, moreover when the reason for the exception is clearly stated.

The modernists should engender in themselves the ability to ruminate although the density of their intellectual faculty and contamination of their Imaani faculty do make this difficult. They should make an effort to view narrations with their *Aql*, not with their *nafs* (emotion). Why would a professed Muslim seek to negate a practice which the Ummah has inherited from the Sahaabah? And, why will a professed Muslim prefer a style which is salient and lovable to the kuffaar? It is not only the issue of the *topi*. There is a deep disease gripping at the hearts of modernists – the disease of kufr and nifaaq. It is to these diseases they have to jar their hearts

and ponder and try to fathom the direction in which they have drifted and in which they are abysmally sliding.

Then on the basis of this narration, Mr. Sayyid Sabiq, the so-called Egyptian scholar who is the uncle's *'daleel'*, claims: *"According to the Hanafiyyah one can pray with his head uncovered."* This is a stupid falsity which Mr. Sabiq has sucked out from his *nafs* because he, himself inclines to the western kuffaar practice of exposing the head. Mr. Sabiq has absolutely no Shar'i proof for this stupid arbitrary conclusion which he has erroneously made on the basis of Ibn Askr's narration. According to the Hanafiyyah (the Hanafis) and the entire Ummah, it is necessary to cover the head, not only during Salaat, but at all times. In fact, Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh), the leader and chief of the Hanafiyyah, was so rigid in wearing his *topi* that even in privacy he did not bare his head. When he was asked about his practical emphasis and rigidity in this regard, Hadhrat Imaam A'zam (rahmatullah alayh) replied: *"Should I not feel shy for the Angels?"* Imaam Abu Hanifah (rahmatullah alayh) abhorred being without a *topi* even when he was alone in his bedroom because he did not want the Malaaikeh to see him bare-headed like the kuffaar. So, what Mr. Sabiq has alleged is plain drivell which he was constrained to gorge out in justification of the western practice of immodest baring of the head – a practice which is abhorrent in Islam. The abhorrence of this western kuffaar practice is amply illustrated by the fact that the Fuqaha have ruled that a man who struts about in public without *topi* is *Mardoodush Shahaadat*, i.e. his testimony is unacceptable in an Islamic Court of Law. The uncle's *daleel* is thus arrant nonsense and a display of stupidity which he has irrationally exhibited in a puerile attempt to present Islamic validity for a practice which is a conspicuous feature of identification in the western kuffaar culture. For the uncle, the warning of Rasullullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) should be an adequate eye-opener:

"Whoever emulates a nation becomes of them."

The proud uncle and all those of his ilk should at least be honest to themselves by acknowledging only to themselves that they have acquired the bare-head practice from their western tutors. Never did they gain this immodest practice from the Sahaabah or from the Taabieen or from the Tabe Taabieen or from the Ummah at large.

To this day it is the Sunnah of the Ummah at large, of course with the exclusion of the western-educated deviates – to wear topis and amaamahs. The uncle knows in the innermost recess of his heart to which camp he belongs inspite of the external profession of Islam.

The claim that “according to the Hanafiyyah, one can pray with his head uncovered” is a deception intentionally fabricated to mislead. It is similar to saying: *according to the Hanafiyyah, one can pray with the entire body naked as long as the portion from the knees to the navel is covered*. Or it is like saying: *according to the Hanafiyyah one can pray, with his wife’s dress and panties*. Or like saying: *according to the Hanafiyyah one can pray with his kurtah wrapped around his satr zone, and his pants wrapped around his upper body*. In fact, according to all the Math-habs, the Salaat will be validly discharged in any one of these styles of lunaticism. But, is it permissible to perform Salaat in such an evil state without valid reason? Does the modernist cult inherited from westernism tolerate that a person performs Salaat dressed in his wife’s panties and her dress, and then step into the Musjid to advertise his style, and then to argue that his satr is covered, hence his Salaat is valid? Unisex garments are valid wearing apparel in the cult the modernist deviates emulate. But, does the Imaani intelligence of the Mu’mineen tolerate performance of Salaat in such *mal-oon* attire?

We are certain that inspite of the uncle’s modernity and deviation from the Sunnah, he has not as yet degenerated into the despicable rut in which the derangement of a man’s natural attitudes constrain wholehearted acceptance of the male’s acclimatisation to attire which belongs exclusively to the female’s wardrobe. We are sure that as yet, the uncle does not believe that one can pray with the panties and dress of one’s wife. If he has already degenerated to the degree of acceptance, then of course, this *naseehat* is not meant for him by any stretch of imagination. Assuming that he still enjoys the degree of intellectual equilibrium and discernment which make such female attire reprehensible for a male, then it shall be argued that *tashabbuh bin nisaail mu’minaat* (emulating the Believing women of Islam) is a lesser crime than *tashabbuh bil kuffaar* (emulating the kuffaar). But while our uncle will most assuredly castigate a man who struts around in his wife’s dress and

panties, notwithstanding her being a pious Muslimah, he condones and reveres a man who adopts the bare-head practice of the kuffaar. Let everyone understand this *mas'alah* clearly – From the time of Hadhrat Aadam (alayhis salaam) until the advent of Muhammadur Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam), and from his time until this time, it always was the practice of all Muslim Ummats to cover their heads. The lewd custom of baring the head developed just recently in emulation of the western kuffaar.

It should also be understood that the reprehensibility and the lewdness of head-exposure no longer have gravity and notoriety because Muslims by their adoption of western norms have lost their Imaani inhibitions to evil and immodesty. They have become thoroughly desensitised. Their acclimatisation to western norms and styles has blinded them, hence they are unable in their spiritual blindness to perceive the degree of the evil which accompanies the bare head.

In an attempt to vindicate his overt profession of Islam, the uncle avers: “.....*I will be accused, because I am ‘anti-‘ulama’. I am not.*” In fact, uncle is anti-Sunnah – anti-Islam. The Ulama are proud scapegoats because Rasulullah (sallallahu alayhi wasallam) has made the Ulama-e-Haqq the Shields which protect his Sunnah. It is these Shields which guard the Shariah ensconced in the Qur’aan and the Sunnah. The uncle’s pleading of not being ‘anti-‘ulama’ neither impresses nor conceals the kufr which springs from a corrupt mind and a heart despoiled by kufr inclinations and preferences. For the benefit of such modernist brothers who have as yet not degenerated into the lowest ebb of deviation which qualifies a man for *kufr* and *irtidaad*, the Fuqaha have ruled: “*Miswaak is Sunnah, but its denial is kufr.*”

Denying, ridiculing, mocking and treating with disdain and insignificance any act, teaching, practice, custom, tenet or belief of Islam is kufr. So, if uncle and his ilk are not comfortable with a topic in front of western eyes, then let them discard it while acknowledging their Imaani deficiency to themselves in their hearts. At least, then there is some hope that when the “*hearts and eyes of men are upturned*” – Qur’aan, at the time of Maut, the Kalimah may

still manifest itself on the tongues of such corrupt and unjust deviates who spent and abused their entire lives imitating a people who wallow in physical and spiritual *najaasat* – janaabat and kufr.

As for Mr. Sabiq's *Fiqhus Sunnah*, it is an insult to place it alongside or in the same shelf on which the *Kutub* of the Fuqaha of Islam are placed. Neither Mr. Sabiq nor his book has any standing in the firmament of Islamic Uloom. The poor molvi sahib while totally unimpressed with the stupid '*daleel*' of the child, was constrained to maintain silence in consideration of his job. While he is a molvi sahib to be pitied and sympathised with, he is not an Aalim of the Deen in the meaning of the Qur'aan.

The article written by the uncle is drivel from beginning to end. In it he only spews out the noxious effects of the *ilhadd* which the heart harbours. His claims and arguments are too puerile, insipid and Islamically ridiculous to entertain intelligently.

Our booklet, *Dress According to the Sunnah*, discusses the issue of the topi in greater detail. Anyone interested in it may write for a copy. The postage is R4,80 (Jan 2011).

Salaam on those who follow the Hidaayat of Allah.

Issued by

**MUJLISUL ULAMA OF S. A.
P. O. BOX 3393
PORT ELIZABETH
6056**